



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,511	01/16/2001	Takayuki Hisanaka	2309/01158	5640

7590

01/30/2004

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
805 Third Avenue
new York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, CATHARINE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/761,511

Applicant(s)

HISANAKA, TAKAYUKI

Examiner

C. Lynne Anderson

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ehrnsperger et al. (6,160,200).

With respect to claims 1-3, 6, and 8-10, Ehrnsperger discloses an absorbent article 20 comprising a liquid pervious topsheet 24, a backsheet 26, and an absorbent core 26, as shown in figures 1-6. A skin-protective ingredient containing layer is applied to the upper surface of the topsheet 24, as disclosed in column 6, line 64-column 7, line 17. The skin-protective ingredient is fully capable of forming an oily film on the skin of a wearer. A support layer 60 is formed over the skin protective ingredient containing layer, as disclosed in column 17, lines 59-62. The support layer 60 is soluble in water at and above 25 degrees Celsius, as disclosed in column 10, lines 36-53 and column 13, lines 1-23. It is the examiner's position that since the support layer is soluble in water, at 100% humidity, the support layer is therefore promoted at 100% humidity, which is greater than 30% humidity. The support layer 60 comprises polyvinyl alcohol, as disclosed in column 11, lines 38-41. The support layer 60 comprises, in at least a part

Art Unit: 3761

of the absorbent article 20, only the soluble material 66, as disclosed in column 11, lines 3-5. The support layer 60 is therefore capable of exposing the skin protective ingredient containing layer to the skin of a wearer after dissolving.

With respect to claim 7, the absorbent article 20, as shown in figure 2, further comprises a leak-preventive cuff and a leg cuff, as disclosed in column 9, lines 49-50 and column 17, lines 18-55.

With respect to claim 11, the support layer 60 further comprises a body adhering composition formed of a polyethylene oxide, as disclosed in column 15, lines 58-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrnsperger et al. (6,160,200) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Roe et al. (5,607,760).

Ehrnsperger discloses all aspects of the claimed invention but remains silent as to the composition of the skin-protective ingredient. Ehrnsperger discloses in column 7, lines 2-5, the skin-care ingredient comprises the lotion described in U.S. Patent No. 5,607,760 to Roe et al.

Roe discloses in column 10, lines 5-10, the skin-protective ingredient containing layer comprises liquid at 35 degrees Celsius. Roe further discloses in column 15, lines

Art-Unit: 3761

'55-56, petroleum jelly. The skin-protective ingredient of Roe reduces adherence of waste to the wearer and improves skin softness, as disclosed in column 3, lines 3-9.

It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide the lotion taught by Roe as the skin-protective ingredient of Ehrnsperger, to reduce adherence of waste to the wearer and improve skin softness.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4 November 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Ehrnsperger does not positively disclose the transfer of lotion, but rather is directed to the transfer of waste away from the body, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The dissolution of the support layer, or waste passage member 60, of Ehrnsperger removes the barrier between the wearer and the skin-protective ingredient present on the body-facing surface of the topsheet. After the dissolution of the support layer, the skin-protective ingredient is capable of being transferred to the wearer.

Art. Unit: 3761

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the support layer being completely dissolved) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The instant claim only discloses the support layer is soluble in water.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Lynne Anderson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (703) 308-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3590.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

CLA
cla

January 23, 2004

GLD
GLENN K. DAWSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER